DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 514 SP 016 238

AUTHOR Osmond, Patrick Kevin
TITLE Teacher Assessment of Supervisory Evaluations.
PUB DATE Jan 78
NOTE 57p.; Master's Thesis, Wayne State College.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Participation; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

After a review of literature on teacher attitudes about teacher evaluation, an assessment was made of secondary school teacher attitudes toward their evaluations and the changes they would like to have made in evaluation procedures. Results of a questionnaire, responded to by 40 teachers, revealed: (1) The more years of teaching experience a teacher had, the fewer evaluations made per year; (2) There was a positive relationship between a teacher's perception of the main purpose of evaluations and changes made in teaching techniques after evaluation; (3) Teachers are apt to make changes in their teaching if they accept their evaluations as accurate; (4) A majority of teachers did not regard their evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance; and (5) Teachers would like to have more input in evaluation procedures. A bibliography and the attitude measurement instrument are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200514

fac

Jan '78

TEACHER ASSESSMENT OF SUPERVISORY EVALUATIONS

A File Paper

Presented to

Dr. Arnold Emry

Wayne State College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

by

Patrick Kevin Osmond

January 1978

SP 016 238

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patrick Kevin Osmond
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 2

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY 3

2. SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE 4

CRITICISM OF PAST EVALUATION PROCEDURES 4

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVALUATION AND SUPERVISION 12

TEACHER REACTION TO SUPERVISION 16

SUMMARY 18

3. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 19

METHODOLOGY 19

ANALYSIS OF TEACHER RESPONSE 20

Years Taught by Teachers 20

Number and Length of Evaluations 21

Years Taught versus Number of Evaluations per Year 23

Person Conducting Evaluations 23

Forms and Procedures Used in Evaluations 23

Purpose of Evaluations 26

3

JUL 3 1980

Chapter Page

Evaluations as Accurate Assessments of Teaching 29

Time Spent by Supervisors on Evaluations 30

Teachers' Reactions to Administrators' Use of Evaluations 31

Teacher Reaction to Evaluation 32

Changes in Evaluation Procedures 32

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 35

SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 35

CONCLUSIONS 37

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 39

APPENDIXES

A. COVER LETTER 43

B. QUESTIONNAIRE 44

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number of Years Taught in Present School	21
2.	Number of Times Respondents Were Evaluated in a School Year	22
3.	Length of Evaluations	22
4.	Relation between Number of Years Taught and Number of Evaluations per Year	24
5.	Person(s) Responsible for Conducting Evaluations	25
6.	Type of Form Used in Evaluations	26
7.	Procedures Used in Teacher Evaluations	27
8.	Teacher Perception of the Main Purpose of Evaluations	28
9.	A Comparison of Length and Number of Evaluations to Teachers' Responses to the Question, "Do You Feel Your Supervisor Spends Enough Time Evaluating You?"	31
10.	Teacher Reaction to Evaluation	32
11.	Changes Teachers Say They Favor in Evaluation Procedures	34

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the most difficult tasks of any administrator, whether in education, business, or some other function, is to determine the effectiveness of personnel. In handling this problem, administrators generally use a system of formal evaluations. The problems in determining employee effectiveness in business have been documented by the Conference Board, a business research group. Two major problems cited by the Conference Board involved inaccurate appraisals of employee performance, and lack of time administrators spend in making evaluations.[1]

The problems involved in determining teacher effectiveness are also well-documented and are similar. Lack of time spent by evaluators, lack of communication between teachers and evaluators, and disagreement over forms and procedures used in evaluations are but a few of the problems that plague teacher evaluations. Biddle and Ellena summed it up well when they wrote:

> With all this research activity, results have been modest and often contradictory. Few if any facts are now deemed established about teacher effectiveness and many formal findings have been repudiated. It is not an

---

[1]Associated Press dispatch, Chicago Tribune, November 17, 1977, p. 10, cols. 1-2.

> exaggeration to say that we do not today know how to select, train for, encourage, or evaluate teacher effectiveness.[2]

Perhaps evaluations can be improved and made more accurate if evaluators know what teachers think of their evaluations. If teachers disagree with all or part of their evaluations, there is a good chance that very little benefit will come of them.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The major objective of this study was to assess secondary-school teacher attitudes toward their evaluations. To achieve this objective, teacher opinion was sought, by means of a questionnaire dealing with areas such as the main purpose of evaluations, the accuracy of evaluations, changes made by teachers after their evaluations, and whether evaluations were used to teachers' disadvantage. It was hypothesized that the responses to these questions would reveal teacher attitudes toward their evaluations.

A secondary objective of this study was to determine the types of evaluation forms and procedures used in evaluations throughout Northeast Nebraska. Another secondary objective was to assess the changes teachers say they would like to have made in evaluation procedures used in their schools.

---

[2]Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (eds.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. vi.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The idea for this study originated when a teacher told the author that her evaluation was being used to intimidate her. Because the purpose of evaluations is to stimulate the improvement of instruction, the study was designed to discover if other teachers had a similar reaction. A review of the related literature disclosed comparatively little research dealing with teacher assessment of their evaluations. As a result, a survey concerning teacher assessment of their evaluations was made of sixty-three junior-senior high-school teachers in Northeast Nebraska.[3]

---

[3] A complete explanation of the methodology is contained in Chapter 3.

Chapter 2

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

The process of evaluation has probably been debated by educators with more intensity and deeper concern than any other aspect of education. The subject of this chapter includes three phases of evaluation: (1) criticisms of past evaluation procedures, (2) the relationship between evaluation and supervision, and (3) teachers' reaction to supervision.

CRITICISM OF PAST EVALUATION PROCEDURES

One major criticism of past evaluation procedures has been that teachers and supervisors do not always agree as to what constitutes effective teaching. In addition, these groups do not always agree as to what instrument should be used to measure teacher effectiveness. A study of selected teachers at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, concluded that possibly neither the teacher nor the supervisor is capable of correctly evaluating teacher effectiveness.[1]

As a result of this controversy between supervisors

---

[1]David T. McAfee, "Evaluation of the Teacher: Do Teachers and Supervisors Agree?" High School Journal, 58:339, May, 1975.

and teachers, many different types of evaluation forms and procedures have been devised. The following is a summary of evaluation practices used in the last fifty years.

According to James Buck and James Parsely, prior to and during the 1930s most educators agreed the best way to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers was to observe them teaching in the classroom. In order to assist evaluators measuring the proficiency of teachers, education specialists created rating scales to determine the teachers' social relations, instructional skills, personal characteristics, and professional qualifications.[2] However, in studying evaluations based on a rating scale as a major determinant of teaching effectiveness, researchers found the criteria used were often arbitrary and vague. In 1945, Reavis and Cooper analyzed specific items in rating forms. In their subsequent report they noted certain weaknesses in rating scales commonly used in school systems: a lack of definition of items, ambiguous terms, and "items that linked two independent elements for a single judgement." On this basis the authors concluded, "Ratings appear to be invalid, then, as comprehensive measures of either general or specific teaching ability."[3]

---

[2]James J. Buck and James F. Parsely, Jr., The Way We See It: A Survey of Teacher Evaluation Policies and Practices Operant in the State of Washington, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 084-223, March, 1973.

[3]W. C. Reavis and D. H. Cooper, Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems. Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 59 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), cited by Hazel Davis, "Evolution of Current Practices in

In the same vein, A. G. Hellfritzsch concluded: "Teacher rating scales . . . have little in common with any of the teacher abilities measured, including the ability of the teacher to promote pupil growth.[4] In 1954, Harold M. Anderson seemed to concur with the findings of Reavis and Cooper and of Hellfritzsch:

> In general no adequate basis for validation of teachers exists at present. There is apparently no general agreement as to what is good teaching, and even if there were, present day measures lack the reliability necessary for valid criteria.[5]

With the revival of interest in merit pay proposals in the 1940s, it became increasingly important to measure the "effective teacher." In a number of states, programs were initiated in which supervisors would evaluate teachers on factors other than degree and experience. The programs for the most part failed. As of 1967, in only four of the eight states surveyed--Georgia, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Utah --were programs still in existence.[6]

Evaluating Teacher Competence," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, ed. Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), pp. 53-54.

[4]A. G. Hellfritzsch, "A Factor Analysis of Teacher Abilities," Journal of Experimental Education, 14:184, December, 1945.

[5]Harold Milton Anderson, "A Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, 23:69, September, 1954.

[6]James H. McPhail, Teacher Evaluation--A State-by-State Analysis, U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document, ED 014-449, October, 1967. States where supervisors attempted to evaluate teachers by ways other than

Another method used to evaluate teacher effectiveness has been to compare a teacher characteristic or personality trait with a specific outcome variable. Some traits that were considered in evaluating teacher effectiveness were sex, age, socio-economic background, academic achievement, marital status, intelligence, and voice quality. In an exhaustive study conducted in 1957 involving over 6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools and 450 school systems, David Ryans was unable to find any variable that had a significant correlation with teacher effectiveness.[7] Ryans further explained that effective teaching must be correlated with three sets of conditions:

---

degree and/or experience include:

(1) Delaware: salary increases for teachers with certain ratings.

(2) Florida: Career Increment Competency Awards and National Teacher Examination scores.

(3) Georgia: National Teacher Examination scores for sixth- and seventh-year certificates.

(4) New York: Merit Promotional Increments.

(5) North Carolina: a series of experimental programs.

(6) South Carolina: National Teacher Examination.

(7) Tennessee: a salary differential supplement to superior teachers.

(8) Utah: Twenty dollars for each Distribution Unit to be applied for salary differentials.

[7]David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison and Appraisal. A Research Study (Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Company, inc., 1960), p. 370.

(1) The social or cultural group in which the teacher operates, involving social values which frequently differ from person to person, community to community, culture to culture, and time to time.

(2) The grade level and subject matter being taught.

(3) Intellectual and personal characteristics of the pupils taught.[8]

In the 1960s a new method of estimating teacher effectiveness became popular. This method involved observing interaction between the teacher and students in a classroom. In order to measure this interaction accurately, a number of indices were created: Flanders' Interaction Analysis Procedure, Mark's Verbal Reaction Behavior, and Log and Ober's Reciprocal Category System. There are differing opinions in the literature concerning how much interaction analysis improved instruction. Campbell and Barnes reported that interaction analysis provided an approach for objective evaluation instead of the subjective evaluations used throughout the country. They wrote:

> We can now give the teacher something definite, both in the form of diagnosis and subsequent prognosis to utilize in improving his teaching, and perhaps we can move away from the hopelessly vague folklore which has come to be known as education.[9]

A less enthusiastic view than that of Campbell and Barnes was that of Borah Rosenshine:

> It is possible that the major usefulness of IA [Interaction Analysis] will be in identifying extremes

---

[8] Ibid., p. 371.

[9] James Reed Campbell and Cyrus W. Barnes, "Interaction Analysis--A Breakthrough," Phi Delta Kappan, 50:589, June, 1969.

> --those teachers who are most or least effective--and that the scatter in the middle will be too large to fit any type of curve.[10]

Questioning older methods of evaluation, educational researchers have advocated giving the teacher a more active role in the evaluation process. The rationale behind this approach is that if a teacher has an active role in the evaluation process, he will be more apt to consider using suggested changes in his instruction. One system based on the teacher self-evaluation concept was launched by E. Wayne Robeson. Using his own Teacher Self Appraisal Observation System in California and Arizona schools, Dr. Robeson saw:

> (1) an increased awareness of different instructional patterns.
>
> (2) an improvement of teacher morale and attitude.
>
> (3) improved instruction.
>
> (4) increased student achievement.[11]

A recent innovation in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness is micro-teaching. In this system a conventional lesson is scaled down in three ways: it lasts only five or ten minutes; it is presented to a "class" of five volunteers in place of the regular pupils; and it is designed for the teacher to exhibit just one specific skill, which is the subject of the evaluation. The lesson is recorded on

---

[10]Borah Rosenshine, "Interaction Analysis: A Tardy Comment," Phi Delta Kappan, 51:446, April, 1970.

[11]E. Wayne Robeson, "Teacher Self Appraisal: A Way to Improve Instruction," Journal of Teacher Education, 22: 471, Winter, 1971.

video-tape, and while the teacher listens to himself, he receives criticism from specially-trained supervisors. Then he repeats the lesson to a new group of volunteers, in an attempt to improve on his first presentation. From the video-tape of the second presentation the teacher can determine whether he has improved.[12]

Opponents of the micro-teaching method of evaluation have asserted that a teacher does not use the same techniques with a class of volunteer "pupils" as he does with a regular class. Also, because the teaching is conducted in an artificial milieu, the results may be invalid.[13]

Another method used to evaluate teachers involves accountability techniques. The concern over accountability became so widespread that by 1974 forty state legislatures had enacted or attempted to enact evaluation programs based on accountability techniques. Have teachers accepted accountability in evaluation? In assessing the Michigan accountability system, E. R. Hause, Wendell Rivers, and D. L. Stufflebeam submitted that one of the most censurable aspects of the Michigan system was the use of test scores as the major criteria for determining teacher effectiveness.[14]

---

[12]N. L. Gage, "An Analytical Approach to Research on Instructional Methods," Phi Delta Kappan, 49:602, June, 1968.

[13]Buck and Parsely, loc. cit.

[14]Ernest Hause, Wendell Rivers, and Daniel L. Stufflebeam, "An Assessment of the Michigan Accountability System," Phi Delta Kappan, 55:667, June, 1974.

In discussing the total Michigan accountability effort, the authors described it as "a giant snowball rolling down a hill." While admitting the accountability model had a number of good features, they found it "unfortunately was not thoroughly thought through, and it has gathered a momentum somewhat lacking in thoughtful control."[15]

In discussing the accountability procedures used at the Mt. Diablo school district in California, Christopher Cory reported that the results had been "somewhat less than baffo" [sic].[16] Cory's major criticisms of the accountability program were: (1) there was too much paperwork involved, (2) it encouraged narrow teaching, and (3) the measuring devices were not adapted to all the different problems the teachers confront. Cory concluded that the "dead hand" of accountability "can only increase both paperwork and paranoia."[17]

Using accountability in determining teacher effectiveness seems to fall in the same category as merit pay--although it looks appealing in theory it is extremely difficult to put into practice. In a recent survey of 300 teachers and student teachers in a four-state area, 79 percent of the teachers generally supported the idea of accountability;

---

[15]Ibid., p. 669.

[16]Christopher Cory, "The Heavy Hand of Accountability," Learning: The Magazine for Creative Teaching, 2:24, March, 1974.

[17]Ibid., pp. 24, 25, 26, 28.

however, of that group, 55 percent had some reservations. The researchers interpreted these reservations as evidence that whereas most teachers were not opposed to some type of accountability in a hypothetical sense, they felt it would not work in practice.[18]

In discussing accountability, Allan Ornstein stated that before the accountability movement proceeds any farther the following questions must be answered: (1) Where does teacher accountability begin and end? (2) Who determines who will be held accountable for what and to whom? (3) How are the results going to be measured?[19] Dr. Ornstein's reaction to and skepticism about accountability are added indications that even today numerous people question its value.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVALUATION AND SUPERVISION

The term "supervision" has many connotations. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, supervision is "the act, process, or occupation of supervising."[20] To the educator, the definition of supervision is probably not as important as the purpose, that is, to improve instruction.

---

[18]Thomas L. Good and others, "How Teachers View Accountability," Phi Dela Kappan, 56:367-368, January, 1975.

[19]Allan C. Ornstein, "The Politics of Accountability," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 8: 74-75, November, 1975.

[20]Philip Babcock Gove and others (eds.), Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1966).

Although techniques of supervision have changed in the last seventy years the main goal has not. As early as 1913, an article in A Cyclopedia of Education contained the statement, "The chief function of supervision is to improve teaching practice."[21] Thirty years later, in the Encyclopedia of Modern Education, supervision of instruction was defined as "the variety of means used by administrators, supervisors, and teachers themselves to improve the teaching and learning process."[22]

In 1959, H. M. Harmes defined supervision as "services provided for the improvement of instruction."[23] In 1975, Kimball Wiles defined instructional supervision as "an organizational behavior system that interacts with the teaching behavior system to improve the quality of education for students."[24]

Although educational researchers agree that the most important goal of supervision is the improvement of instruction, they have not determined whether this actually happens.

---

[21] H[enry] S[uzzallo], "Supervision of Teaching," A Cyclopedia of Education (1913), V, 468.

[22] Leo M. Chamberlain and Freeman R. Butts, "Supervision of Instruction," Encyclopedia of Modern Education, ed. Harry N. Rivlin (New York: Philosophical Library Inc., 1943), p. 781.

[23] H. M. Harmes, "Improving Teaching through Supervision: How Is It Working?" Educational Administration and Supervision, 59:169, May, 1959.

[24] Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell, Supervision for Better Schools (Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. vii.

In 1964 the Research Division of the National Education Association completed a survey of administrative practices in the area of evaluation and the reaction of teachers, principals, and superintendents to these practices. To the question, "What desirable outcomes from the program of teacher evaluation have you observed in your school system? Add other comments if you wish," the outcome mentioned most frequently by superintendents, principals, and teachers was that the program "stimulates staff to improve instruction."[25] Whereas this seems to concur with what educational researchers previously have found, a closer look at the data is in order. In no group participating in the survey did over 42 percent of the superintendents, 52 percent of the principals, or 25 percent of the teachers making written comments, respond that evaluations improved instruction.[26]

In examining these percentages it is important to note that administrators reported more improvements than teachers did. In fact, 26 percent of all teachers who wrote comments stated they "had observed no desirable outcomes from the school system's teacher evaluation program."[27]

One of the teachers' major criticisms concerning their evaluations was that administrators were too busy with

---

[25]National Education Association--Research Division, Evaluation of Classroom Teachers (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964), p. 64

[26]Ibid., pp. 83, 90, 101.

[27]Ibid., p. 68.

other duties to conduct effective evaluations.[28] Teachers were not the only ones with this complaint. In all but one of the categories of principals surveyed, over half of the principals surveyed reported their schedules did not allow enough time for accurate evaluations of classroom teachers.[29] One principal commented: "I feel I am doing a very poor job in the area of teacher evaluation. Other duties prevent visitations as much as I would desire."[30]

In a similar study, some Louisiana school supervisors revealed they spent most of their time performing tasks such as visiting classrooms, doing clerical work, conferring with principals and teachers, working with lay groups, traveling, and participating in conferences. On analysis, nearly half of these activities turned out to be unrelated to the improvement of instruction.[31]

Finally, whether evaluations were written or oral seemed to have an impact on their effectiveness. In schools where written evaluations were used, larger percentages of principals and teachers reported improved instruction than in schools where oral evaluations were used.[32]

---

[28]Ibid.

[29]Ibid., p. 90.

[30]Ibid., p. 71.

[31]Thomas R. Landry, "Louisiana Supervisors Examine Their Practices," Educational Administration and Supervision, 59:310, September, 1959.

[32]National Education Association--Research Division, op. cit., p. 65.

One inference that can be drawn from this evidence is: Supervisors should take a major role in evaluating teachers, but many do not. When supervisors do not spend enough time with evaluations, they cannot determine which teachers are incompetent. More important, potentially good teachers may remain mediocre because many of the recommendations that could have been made to improve teaching have not been made.

TEACHER REACTION TO SUPERVISION

Probably more significant than the method of supervision is the reaction of the teacher to the concept of supervision. In discussing this issue, Cogan noted that whenever teachers anticipate being supervised they react in one of two general ways:

> (1) a kind of emotionalized allegiance to the concept of supervision; or
>
> (2) a swift and apprehensive rejection of all but a narrow range of approved supervisory activities.[33]

Beyond these, Cogan listed six specific types of teacher reaction toward supervision:

> (1) a clear ambivalence about supervision; a dramatic contrast between a strong commitment to the principle of supervision and a stubborn, deep-seated distrust of direct supervisory intervention in the classroom;
>
> (2) a desire to focus supervision on inspirational leadership and on broad objectives rather than specifics;
>
> (3) a need for a "human relations" orientation in the entire endeavor;

---

[33]Morris Cogan, Clinical Supervision (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973), p. 16.

(4) a generalized rejection of supervision designed to work directly on changes in the teacher's classroom behavior;

(5) a need to exert powerful controls over the kinds of supervision practiced in the schools, expressing itself sometimes as a demand for self-supervision or for supervision mainly by invitation; and

(6) a need of some teachers to seek the protective anonymity of a group through a focus on group work rather than individual programs of improvement.[34]

Agreeing in principle with Cogan but writing more candidly were Casey Banas and Sandra Feldman. Banas, in observing teachers' distrust of the supervisor, reported that teachers are not likely to report any of their weaknesses to the supervisor lest this be used as "just cause" for not renewing their contract.[35]

Feldman argued that teachers may fear supervisors because they could be the victims of an evasion of responsibility process. That is, in attempting to evade responsibility for some teacher's action that has aroused the anger of parents, of the school board, or of any other group, the principal may complain: "It's not my fault the teacher's contract prevents me from doing what you suggest."[36] In her most acid comment Feldman said teachers fear supervision because:

. . . existing methods of evaluating are subjective, punitively oriented, based on the opinion of supervisors

---

[34]Ibid.

[35]Chicago Tribune, October 5, 1977, Sec. I, p. 7, col. 6.

[36]Sandra Feldman, Teacher Evaluation: A Teacher Unionist's View, U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, FRIC Document ED 086-647, November, 1972.

> who do not know more about teaching than they do; [these evaluations] are easily used in a discriminating way against the outspoken, the nonconformers, the union activist, the creative . . . .[37]

SUMMARY

The related literature dealt with three aspects of evaluation: criticisms of past evaluation procedures; the relationship between evaluation and supervision; and teachers' reactions to evaluation.

In criticisms of past evaluation procedures it was noted that teachers and supervisors do not always agree as to the most effective instrument for these procedures. These procedures made use of rating scales, merit pay, comparisons of teacher characteristics with specific outcomes, interaction analysis, teacher involvement in evaluations, microteaching techniques, and accountability techniques.

The literature dealing with the relationship between evaluation and supervision revealed that in the opinion of principals, teachers, and superintendents, the most important goal of evaluation is the improvement of instruction. Both teachers and principals complained that not enough time was spent by principals in evaluating teachers.

In discussing teachers' reactions to evaluation, the literature showed that teachers react in various ways toward evaluation, from acceptance of evaluative activities to a total rejection of them.

---

[37]Ibid.

Chapter 3

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the sample selected for the survey and explain the procedures used in gathering the data. Also, the chapter includes the results derived from the data obtained in the survey.

METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study was to gather information and data related to junior and senior high school teachers' assessments of evaluations in public and parochial systems in Northeast Nebraska. A questionnaire and a letter explaining the intent of the survey (see Appendixes) were mailed to one teacher in each of fifty-seven public schools and six parochial schools in Northeast Nebraska, selected at random from the Nebraska Educational Directory (1976-77). Northeast Nebraska was defined as that part of Nebraska bounded on the north and east by the Missouri River, on the south by Nebraska highway 91, and on the west by Nebraska highway 14. Each teacher was assured anonymity. The questionnaires were mailed on November 12, 1977, to the selected teachers. Of a possible sixty-three responses, forty were received, for a 63 percent return. The data were then tabulated and analyzed. A follow-up study of those who did not return the

questionnaires was not conducted because, owing to the anonymity of the respondents, it was impossible to determine which teachers had not returned questionnaires.

ANALYSIS OF TEACHER RESPONSE

Questionnaires used in the survey were sent to each district in Northeast Nebraska with a school containing grades seven through twelve. Of the forty returned, three lacked answers to most of the questions because teachers at these schools had not been evaluated. Some other respondents did not answer all questions and still others did not follow directions, so that the responses to some of the questions had to be thrown out.

Years Taught by Teachers

Because teachers with more experience might react differently to evaluations than those with less experience, teachers were asked the number of years they had taught in their present school. Table 1 (see page 21) shows the number of years the teachers had taught in their present school. It was found in this survey that a majority of the teachers in the sample had taught four or more years in their school. The small percentage of first-year teachers can be attributed to the fact that the sample was selected from the 1976-1977 edition of the Nebraska Educational Directory and the survey was conducted before the 1977-1978 edition was available; as a result, most of those teachers who would have been in their

Table 1

Number of Years Taught in Present School

Years taught in present school	Number	Percent
1	1	2.5
2	9	22.5
3	6	15.0
4 or more	24	60.0
Total	40	100.00

first year of teaching would not be included in the sample.

Number and Length of Evaluations

The number and length of classroom evaluations were also considered to have a significant impact on teacher assessment of their evaluations; hence the respondents were asked the number and length of classroom evaluations. Another concern was whether there was any relation between the number of years taught and the number of evaluations a teacher had in a year. Tables 2 and 3 (see page 22) show the number and length of evaluations of these teachers. Of special interest in Table 2 is the fact that 10 percent of the teachers received no formal evaluations.

Table 3 shows that the majority of the evaluations lasted between thirty minutes and one hour. However, 28 percent of the teachers' evaluations lasted less than fifteen minutes, supporting one of the major criticisms by teachers

cited in Chapter 2--that is, administrators are too busy with other duties to conduct comprehensive evaluations.

Table 2

Number of Times Respondents Were Evaluated in a School Year

Number of Evaluations	Number	Percent
0	4	10.0
1	14	35.0
2	19	47.5
3	2	5.0
4 or more	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

Table 3

Length of Evaluations

Length	Number	Percent
Up to 15 minutes	10	28
From 15 to 30 minutes	10	28
From 30 minutes to one hour	15	41
More than one hour	1	3
Total	36	100

Years Taught versus Number of Evaluations per Year

Table 4 (see page 24) shows a further analysis of the data, the relation between the number of years taught and the number of evaluations a teacher had per year. From the data it appears that the more years of teaching experience a teacher had, the fewer evaluations made per year. Only one teacher with four or more years of teaching experience, and no teacher with three years of teaching experience, had more than two evaluations per year; whereas 33 percent of teachers with two years of experience had more than two evaluations.

Person Conducting Evaluation

Other than the teacher, the most important person involved in the evaluation is the evaluator. This person has to make a judgment as to whether the teacher's performance is superior, mediocre, or poor. Also, because many educators assert that evaluating teachers is one of the primary functions of the principal, this researcher sought to discover if this were the case in this survey. For these reasons, teachers were asked who at their school was responsible for evaluating teachers. It appears from Table 5 (see page 25) that in most schools the principal alone is the evaluator.

Forms and Procedures Used in Evaluations

Impersonal aspects of the evaluation that also have a major impact on teachers are the type of form used and the

Table 4

Relation between Number of Years Taught and Number of Evaluations per Year

Years taught in present school	Number of evaluations per year	Number of teachers having this number of evaluations	Percent
1	0		
	1		
	2	1	100
	3		
	4		
2	0		
	1	2	22
	2	4	45
	3	2	22
	4	1	11
3	0	1	17
	1	1	17
	2	4	66
	3		
	4		
4 or more	0	2	8
	1	12	50
	2	9	38
	3	1	4
	4		

Table 5

Person(s) Responsible for Conducting Evaluations

Person(s) responsible for Evaluations	Number	Percent
Principal	28	77
Superintendent	2	6
Department head	0	0
Committee of evaluators	1	3
Principal and superintendent	5	14
Total	36	100

various procedures used before and after the evaluation. Because these forms vary from district to district, teachers were asked what forms and procedures were used in their evaluations. The data in Table 6 (see page 26) show that several types of forms are used. Although no single type of form is the most popular, a small majority of the evaluators used a single type, not a combination. Those that checked "other" described different forms used. Among them were: "closed form with written comments," "no formal form," "verbal evaluation," and "strong and weak points listed."

As with the forms, several evaluation procedures were used in the different schools. Table 7 (see page 27) shows the procedures used by the evaluators. It must also be mentioned that every respondent to this question specified a combination of two or more procedures. What could not be

Table 6

Type of Form Used in Evaluations

Type of form used	Number	Percent
Open form with written comments	10	27.0
Closed form with a checklist	5	13.5
Rating scales	3	8.0
Videotaped evaluations	0	0.0
Combinations of two or more of the above	12	32.5
Other single types	7	19.0
Total	37	100.0

shown in the table were the exact combinations, and because they were not a major concern of the study they were not tabulated.

Purpose of Evaluations

If evaluations are to have any significance they must serve a specific purpose. Many educational researchers agree that the primary purpose of evaluations is to improve instruction. Yet in one study, based on written comments, only 25.5 percent of the teachers reported this was the reason for their evaluations. In order to determine what teachers in the sample believe is the main purpose of evaluations they were asked to make a judgment as to this main purpose. Table 8 (see page 28) shows that many of the teachers

Table 7

Procedures Used in Teacher Evaluations

Procedures	Number	Percent
Preconference concerning the lesson taught	0	0
Postconference concerning the lesson taught	15	40
Date and time of the evaluation set by the teacher	6	16
Evaluation criteria known to the teacher	22	60
Explanation of evaluation results	28	76
Unannounced evaluations	26	72
Teacher signature on all evaluations	27	74
Teacher receives a copy of evaluation results	25	70
Teacher receives help as a result of evaluations	16	43

surveyed maintained that evaluations are intended to improve instruction. One teacher commented that the main purpose of evaluations was to determine salary increases. Evaluations underlie "merit pay raises to those of us at the top of the master's scale. They get $100, $300, $500 depending on their evaluation." Another teacher, obviously displeased with an evaluation, commented, "Who knows?"

Because evaluations are used to detect superior, mediocre, and poor teaching, evaluators can suggest ways to

Table 8

Teacher Perceptions of the Main Purpose of Evaluations

Perceptions	Number	Percent
Stimulates staff to improve instruction	12	40
Increases communication between teachers and administrators	3	10
Improvement of the school facilities and curriculum	3	10
Serves as a means of keeping "good" teachers and removing "poor" ones	6	20
Other	6	20
Total	30	100

improve teaching. Many evaluators probably do this, but it is not clear how many teachers make changes in their teaching after their evaluations. This was a concern in this study; hence teachers were asked if they had made changes in their teaching techniques after their evaluations. Of the thirty-five respondents to this question, eighteen, or 51 percent, of the teachers answered that they did not make changes and seventeen, or 49 percent, answered that they did. One teacher who said he had made changes comented: "I force learning less and now I am able to understand students and their mistakes with more insight." One teacher who said he did not make any changes wrote: "The person doing the evaluation knows less about teaching than the teacher."

Is there any relation between a teacher's perception of the main purpose of evaluations and a teacher's making changes in his teaching techniques after his evaluation? Apparently there is. A further analysis of the data shows that 64 percent of those who stated that the main purpose of evaluations was to improve instruction made changes in their teaching techniques. Of those who felt their evaluation serves some other purpose, 63 percent did not make any changes in their teaching techniques. This suggests that if evaluators seek changes in teaching techniques from evaluations they should have some sort of agreement with teachers as to the purpose of evaluations.

Evaluations as Accurate Assessments of Teaching

In order for teachers to find their evaluations beneficial they must accept these evaluations as accurate assessments of their performance in the classroom. Evaluations are worth little to teachers who question their accuracy. In order to determine whether teachers accept the accuracy of their evaluations, the sample was asked whether their evaluations were accurate assessments of their teaching performance. Of the thirty-five respondents to this question, twenty-three, or 66 percent, asserted their evaluations were not an accurate assessment of their teaching, and twelve, or 34 percent, asserted they were. In making negative comments on this question one teacher wrote, "When an administrator is in your room pupils will react differently." Another

commented, "One period per year gives very little indication of teaching performance."

Do teachers make changes in their teaching if they accept their evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance? The data seem to indicate they do. Of the twelve who accepted their evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance, 92 percent made changes in their teaching practices. One may infer from this statistic that before teachers make changes in their teaching practices, they must acknowledge that their evaluations accurately reflect their teaching potential.

Time Spent by Supervisors on Evaluations

A major complaint of teachers is that supervisors do not spend enough time on evaluations. Yet, the amount of time spent on this complex task of evaluating a lesson may influence the quality of that evaluation. Do supervisors spend enough time on evaluations? Teachers were asked if their supervisors spent enough time in evaluating them. Of the thirty-five respondents, twenty, or 57 percent, answered that their supervisors did not spend enough time in evaluating them. One teacher commented his supervisor spent "enough time but not enough effort." How much time is enough? As is clear from the teachers' contradictory responses in Table 9 (see page 31), there is no consensus among the respondents concerning how much time is enough for the supervisor to spend in evaluating teachers. The largest numbers of both

Table 9

A Comparison of Length and Number of Evaluations to Teachers' Responses to the Question, "Do You Feel Your Supervisor Spends Enough Time Evaluating You?"

Length	"Yes"	Percent	"No"	Percent
Up to 15 minutes	4	27	5	25
From 15 to 30 minutes	4	27	5	25
From 30 minutes to one hour	6	40	10	50
More than one hour	1	6		
Total	15	100	20	100

positive and negative responses were from teachers whose evaluations were the same length of time--from thirty minutes to one hour.

Teachers' Reactions to Administrators' Use of Evaluations

A vital concern to most teachers is administrators' use of their evaluations. In order for evaluations to be beneficial, teachers must not fear that the results of their evaluations will be used to their disadvantage. Do teachers have this fear? Of the thirty-six respondents to this question, thirty-three, or 91 percent, did not fear that the results of their evaluations were used to their disadvantage. One teacher who responded that the evaluations were used to his disadvantage commented, "Only because there was very little feedback for change."

Teacher Reaction to Evaluation

Another factor influencing the accuracy of the assessment in an evaluation is the teacher's reaction to the evaluation. Therefore, teachers were asked their reactions to their evaluations. The results in Table 10 show that although many teachers welcome the opportunity to be evaluated, there are also many who are quite anxious while they are being evaluated.

Table 10

Teacher Reaction to Evaluation

Reaction	Number	Percent
Welcome the opportunity to be evaluated	13	35
Controlled anxiety	13	35
Outright fear	0	0
Outright rejection of evaluations	2	6
Unaffected by evaluation	9	24
Total	37	100

Changes in Evaluation Procedures

Teachers may be not completely satisfied with part or all of the procedures used in their evaluation and as a result may want some changes made. The last portion of the questionnaire was designed to give the teachers an opportunity to specify the changes they would like in evaluation procedures. The analysis of the responses in Table 11 (see

page 34) reveals that teachers would like to see a wide variety of changes. In writing comments about these procedures one teacher favored more discussion following evaluations, and another urged the use of a checklist in evaluations. An inference that can be drawn from this table is that a majority of the teachers favor and even welcome evaluation. However, many teachers hold they should have input in evaluation procedure.

This completes the analysis of the data. A summary of Chapter 3 and the conclusions derived from Chapter 3 are presented in Chapter 4.

Table 11

Changes Teachers Say They Favor in Evaluation Procedures

Change	Number	Percent
More evaluations	13	36
Less evaluations	0	0
Different evaluation for teachers with more experience	12	33
Evaluation by a teacher committee	6	16
Evaluation by the department head	6	16
More time spent on evaluation	9	25
Evaluation by a committee consisting of teachers, parents, students, and administrator	1	3
Merit pay increases based on evaluations	5	14
No evaluations	0	0
Teacher input in evaluation procedures	22	61
More objective evaluations	6	16
More subjective evaluations	7	19
Others	1	3

Chapter 4

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, the procedures used in gathering the data and the analysis of the data are summarized. Second, this chapter includes the conclusions derived from this study.

SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The teachers surveyed in this study were selected, one from each school, at random out of the Nebraska Educational Directory (1976-77). Questionnaires dealing with eleven aspects of teachers' experience with, and reactions to, evaluation were sent to sixty-three teachers in Northeast Nebraska--the area bounded on the north and east by the Missouri River, on the south by Nebraska highway 91, and on the west by Nebraska highway 14. Forty of the sixty-three responded.

The results of the analysis of the data can be summarized as follows:

1. Most of the teachers who responded had been teaching four or more years in their present school.

2. The number of evaluations ranged from none to four per year.

3. The majority of evaluations lasted from fifteen

minutes to one hour.

4. The more years of teaching experience a teacher had, the fewer evaluations made per year.

5. The principal was usually responsible for conducting evaluations.

6. There were a variety of forms and procedures used in evaluations.

7. Teachers expressed different opinions as to the main purpose of evaluations.

8. There is a positive relationship between a teacher's perception of the main purpose of evaluations and a teacher's making changes in his teaching techniques after his evaluation.

9. Many teachers said their evaluations were not accurate assessments of their teaching performance.

10. Teachers are apt to make changes in their teaching if they accept their evaluations as being accurate.

11. Many teachers said evaluators did not spend enough time in evaluating them, but there was no consensus as to how much time was enough.

12. Most teachers did not complain that evaluations were used to their disadvantage by administrators.

13. Teacher reactions toward evaluations were generally positive.

14. Teachers urged a wide variety of changes made in evaluation procedures.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the data presented in Chapter 3 warrants the following conclusions related to the major purpose of this study--teacher assessments of their evaluations:

1. There is no agreement among teachers as to the main purpose of evaluations.

2. There is a positive relationship between teachers who agree that the main purpose of evaluation is to improve instruction and those who make changes in their teaching techniques after their evaluations.

3. A majority of the teachers do not regard their evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance.

4. Teachers who regard evaluations as accurate assessments of their teaching performance are more likely to make changes in their teaching techniques.

5. Although a majority of the teachers say their supervisors do not spend enough time in evaluating them, there is no consensus among teachers as to how much time is adequate.

6. Evaluations are rarely used by administrators to the teachers' disadvantage.

7. Teachers exhibit a positive reaction toward being evaluated.

8. Teachers ask to have more input in evaluation procedures.

Conclusions that can be made related to the secondary purposes of this paper are:

1. The principal is chiefly responsible for conducting evaluations.

2. Teachers with more teaching experience receive fewer evaluations.

3. Evaluations usually last from fifteen minutes to one hour.

4. There is no single predominant form used in evaluations.

5. The most common procedures used in evaluations are (a) unannounced evaluation, (b) teacher signature on evaluations, (c) explanation of evaluation results, and (d) a copy of evaluation results given to the teacher.

6. The change in evaluation procedures advocated by most teachers is increased teacher input in evaluation procedures.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Biddle, Bruce J., and William J. Ellena, eds. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, inc., 1964.

Cogan, Morris L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

Gove, Philip Babcock, and others, eds. Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1966.

Lovell, John T., and Kimball Wiles. Supervision for Better Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

National Education Association--Research Division. Evaluation of Classroom Teachers. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1964.

Rivlin, Harry N., ed. Encyclopedia of Modern Education. New York: Philosophical Library Inc., 1943.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers: Their Description, Comparison, and Appraisal. A Research Study. Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Company, Inc., 1960.

Slakter, Malcolm J. Statistical Inference for Educational Researchers. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1972.

TenBrink, Terry D. Evaluation. A Practical Guide for Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Periodicals

Anderson, Harold Milton. "A Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, 23:41-71, September, 1954.

Barnes, Cyrus W., and James Reed Campbell. "Interaction Analysis--A Breakthrough," Phi Delta Kappan, 50:587-590, April, 1970.

Chicago Tribune, October 5, 1977, and November 17, 1977.

Cory, Christopher. "The Heavy Hand of Accountability," Learning: The Magazine for Creative Teaching, 2:24-28, March, 1974.

Gage, N. L. "An Analytical Approach to Research on Instructional Methods," Phi Delta Kappan, 49:601-606, June, 1968.

Good, Thomas L., and others. "How Teachers View Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, 56:367-368, January, 1975.

Hall, G. L. "Assessing Teacher Effectiveness: Practical Approaches to Meaningful Evaluations," NASSP Bulletin, 58:153-163, May, 1974.

Harmes, H. M. "Improving Teaching through Supervision: How Is It Working?" Educational Administration and Supervision, 59:169-172, May, 1959.

Hause, Ernest, Wendell Rivers, and Daniel L. Stufflebeam. "An Assessment of the Michigan Accountability System," Phi Delta Kappan, 55:663-669, June, 1974.

Hellfritzsch, A. G. "A Factor Analysis of Teacher Abilities," Journal of Experimental Education, 14:166-199, December, 1945.

Landry, Thomas R. "Louisiana Supervisors Examine Their Practices," Educational Administration and Supervision, 59: 305-311, September, 1959.

McAfee, David T. "Evaluation of the Teacher: Do Teachers and Supervisors Agree?" High School Journal, 58:336-342, May, 1975.

Ornstein, Allan C. "The Politics of Accountability," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 8:73-81, November, 1975.

Robeson, E. Wayne. "Teacher Self Appraisal: A Way to Improve Instruction," Journal of Teacher Education, 22:469-473, Winter, 1971.

Rosenshine, Borah. "Interaction Analysis: A Tardy Comment," Phi Delta Kappan, 51:441-448, April, 1970.

"Teacher Evaluation: A Symposium," NASSP Bulletin, 59:1-50, December, 1975.

ERIC Documents

Buck, James J., and James F. Parsely, Jr. The Way We See It: A Survey of Teacher Evaluation Policies and Practices Operant in the State of Washington. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 084-223, March, 1973.

Feldman, Sandra. Teacher Evaluation: A Teacher Unionist's View. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 086-647, November, 1972.

McPhail, James H. Teacher Evaluation--A State-by-State Analysis. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 014-449, October, 1967.

Encyclopedia Article

S[uzzallo], H[enry]. "Supervision of Teaching," A Cyclopedia of Education, 1913, Vol. V.

APPENDIXES

Dear Colleague:

I feel that teachers are deeply concerned about the way they are being evaluated. In my talks with teachers I have found some who are quite satisfied with their evaluation, but others who are not. I am attempting by means of the enclosed questionnaire to assess teacher opinions of their evaluations. I plan to use the data collected as a basis for a graduate research paper I am writing at Wayne State College.

I would appreciate your taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. Please feel free to add any comments you desire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. You can be assured that in my paper I shall not identify any school or teacher.

I shall be grateful for your cooperation in my project.

Cordially yours,

Patrick K Osmond

Patrick K. Osmond

1. Please check the number of years taught in your present school.
   1st year _____
   2nd year _____
   3rd year _____
   4 or more _____

2. How many times are you evaluated in a school year?
   Once _____
   Twice _____
   Three _____
   Four or more _____

3. Which of the following are used in Teacher Evaluations at your School?
   Procedure: Teacher and Supervisor Interaction:

   A Preconference concerning the lesson taught.....____
   B Postconference concerning the lesson taught.....____
   C Date and time of the Evaluation set by teacher.....____
   D Evaluative criteria known to teachers.....____
   E Explanation of evaluation results.....____
   F Unannounced evaluations.....____
   G Teacher signature on all evaluations.....____
   H Teacher receives a copy of evaluation results.....____
   I Teacher receives help as a result of evaluations.....____

   Evaluator:

   A Principal.....____
   B Superintendent.....____
   C Department Head.....____
   D Committee of evaluators.....____

   Explain:

   Evaluation Form:

   A Open form with written comments.....____
   B Closed form with a check list.....____
   C Rating scales.....____
   D Video taped evaluations.....____
   E Other.....____

   Explain:

   Comments:

4. What do you perceive as the main purpose of evaluations? Check only one.

   A Stimulates teaching staff to improve instruction.....____
   B Increases communication between teachers and administrators....____
   C Improvement of the school facilities and curriculum.....____
   D Serves as a means of keeping "good" teachers and removing "poor" ones.....____
   E Other.....____

5. How long does your evaluation usually last?
   Up to 15 minutes....._____
   15 to 30 minutes....._____
   30 minutes to 1 hour..._____
   more than 1 hour....._____

Explain:

6. Have you made any changes in your teaching practices as a result of your being evaluated?

Yes _____ No_____

Comments:

7. Do you feel your evaluation is an accurate assessment of your teaching performance?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

8. Do you feel your supervisor spends enough time in evaluating you?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

9. Do you feel the results of your evaluation are used to your disadvantage?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

10. Which of the following best describes your reaction to your evaluation?

A Welcome the opportunity to be evaluated....._____
B Controlled anxiety....._____
C Outright fear....._____
D Outright rejection of evaluation....._____
E Unaffected by evaluations....._____

11. Which of the following changes would you like to see in your Evaluation? (check as many as you desire)

A More evaluations....._____
B Less evaluations....._____
C Different evaluations for teachers with more experience....._____
D Evaluation by a teacher committee....._____
E Evaluation by the Department Head....._____
F More time spent on evaluation....._____
G Evaluation by a committee consisting of..... teachers, parents, students and administration....._____
H Merit pay increases as a result of good evaluations.._____
I No evaluations....._____
J Teacher input in evaluation procedures....._____
K More objective evaluations....._____
L More subjective evaluations....._____
M Others:

Additional comments:

Please return in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible, but no later than November 27th.